

Internal Bulletin No.7.

Thursday 20 May

Detective Inspector Windle in witness box.

Ed Rees cross examined Windle about the arrest, interview and statement by Giovanni Singh. There were a lot of questions on detail - all denied by the police. For example, ER asked if Windle knew about GS's mother's illness. He asked if GS's brother had been hostile. Windle maintained that Proctor did the afternoon interview with GS alone and he (W) had not been present.

Questions were asked about the refusal of access to solicitors. Holland had given the order for solicitors to be refused. ER asked: "Did you have anything to fear from solicitors?" W said: "None - other than they might tell the defendants to keep silent." ER asked: "What is the caution?" W said: "The right of silence." ER asked: "That is the law?" W said: "It is a right - whether it is a matter of law is a matter of conjecture." ER asked: "Then, what you were fearful of was that solicitors might tell their clients their rights?" W said: "We were after the truth behind the petrol bombs." ER: "If GS had remained silent, you would have had no case against GS?" W: "Not necessarily so" ER asked: "Do you think solicitors get in the way of such an investigation?" W said: "Certainly do." W went on to maintain that GS had made his statement voluntarily.

There were questions about the briefing by Holland on 30 July. W agreed that names, addresses and details of evidence were given but maintained that no notes were taken.

W denied that "GS was asked a lot of questions about the big ones - TA, TG etc. He was told that he would get into deeper trouble....." and that "Later he shifted his position - he said, yes he had bought the tube, but he didn't know that it was for petrol bombs..... He later found out about the petrol bombs and that they were to be used for self-defence in a possible skinhead attack."

The same points came out about the statement. ER asked: "GS is supposed to have asked to make a statement in formal terms?" W agreed. ER put it to him that that was a lie. He suggested that: "The statement is not a constant narrative from him." He also said that GS had wanted to start his statement from 11 July but W had asked him to go further back to his first meeting with TG. W denied this. ER pointed out that AM's statement, also taken by Windle, has started off with his first meeting with TG. W said: "Perhaps that's where it all did start."

ER also asked: "At the very end, he talks about his arrest on 11 July and that of TA and then he simply volunteered information about petrol bombs: 'petrol bombs weren't used that night because we were arrested.'" W said yes. ER suggested: "He was asked and then replied: 'I don't know. We were arrested.'" W denied this.

Another point had earlier come out in the cross examination when W said that one Special Branch officer had been present at the arrest. His name was not given in court. W said that there was no secrecy about this. "Only to establish the relation between the disturbances in Bradford and the riots in other areas."

The prosecution moved on to the evidence against Tariq Ali. Windle in witness box. He described going to TA's flat to "invite him to the police station". Sabir Hussein was there and was taken to the police station as well.

TA cross examined Windle. He asked if they approached this investigation with an open mind? W said yes. TA asked if any Special Branch officer went with them when they visited any of us. W said: "The Special Branch were present to determine any possible connection between the disturbances in Bradford and the riots elsewhere in Liverpool, Brixton and so on." TA said: "There was no reason why I shouldn't have been present when my flat was being searched. I said I wanted to take my glasses etc. You told your police officers: 'Get him out of here!'" W said: "I was very cordial."

TA cross examined him about the 'discussion' that the police had with him at the station. W said: "We spoke about yourself - the organisations you had belonged to and supported." But W denied that the Special Branch had questioned TA.

Thursday May 20 (cont.)

W said: "I had a natter with you." TA said: "It was a heavy interrogation." W repeated: "It was a natter." TA said: "It was more like an interrogation - there were Special Branch present - small square room with one table. Detective Sergeant Vickerman was there along with three other police officers. It was nothing like a chat. It was a heavy political interrogation." Here the judge intervened to point out that this was a serious allegation. When asked whether he had any record of that discussion, W said that he had just some brief notes. He was asked to read from these notes. He said: "We asked you to tell us about yourself. Your involvement in various campaigns such as those against deportation, H-Block Armagh campaign and others. We asked for your view of the police and you said you regarded them as the instruments of oppression. We also discussed your political views in general." TA claimed that the interrogation had also been about South Africa, Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe and about the whole state of apartheid. W denied this.

S. Kadri cross examined. He pointed out that the notes that W had just read out from talked of that discussion as an interview. W said that interview or discussion was the same word anyway.

J. Gibbs cross examined. In reply to her questions, W explained that there were seven police officers who went to collect TA and Sabir. These seven included one Special Branch and one photographer. He also claimed that he did not know what had happened to SH during the time when police were 'discussing matters' with TA. JG claimed that early that morning some police officers had taken SH in a car and forced him to point out BK's house. W denied any knowledge of this.

Det. Serg. Vickerman in witness box. Confirmed W's story about visit to TA's flat and return to police station. In first place he claimed that he had not heard any of the conversation that had taken place between TA and Windle in his flat. He also explained that out of the team of seven police officers, one was guarding the front of the house, one the back and the photographer was there to photograph the flat before and after the visit to ensure that no complaints were made later. Again he denied that any interrogation had taken place before TA's arrest. But he said: "You spoke of political matters to us." He agreed that he had come at 5.15 p.m. into the interview room to arrest TA and TA had remained silent. He denied that TA had made any request for a solicitor.

S. Kadri pointed out that Vickerman's only note of the 'discussion' also described it as an interview. Again V said: "It's a matter of terminology."

(TA was claiming that to all intents and purposes he was arrested when police took him to the station in the morning and the interview began from then. The police deny this and say he was only invited back to the police station in the morning and that no official interview took place till after the arrest at 5.15.)

Det. Insp. Sidebottom in witness box. He had conducted the first official interview (acc. to police) together with Huntington at 5.45 on 31st July. According to S, TA denied making the petrol bombs throughout this interview and made various replies to the questions put to him. Eventually he was told about the statements made by the others and some were read out to him. TG was brought into the room at TA's request and after a short conversation between the two, TA finally agreed to make a statement. This statement was written very deliberately by TA and signed. He was later cautioned and charged.

TA cross examined. TA stated in the first place that he had not been cautioned before this interview began. He did not make any of the replies that he is supposed to have made. All he said throughout was: "No comment. I want to see a solicitor."

S denied this totally. He claimed that TA consistently denied responsibility for the petrol bombs. Not only during the interview but also upon arrest. (Vickerman the arresting officer had said that TA remained silent upon arrest.)

internal bulletin 7 p.3.

Thursday 20 May (cont)

TA pointed out that he would never say some of the things he is supposed to have said such as: "Coloured people who are less intelligent than police officers are intimidated " and calling the UBYL the UBY Movement which is in the police version. TA repeated that he did not make any comment until after he had talked to TG in Punjabi when he said: "I admit we did make the petrol bombs. But I stress they were made only for our defence. We did not intend to be aggressors." TA claimed that when he then sat down to write out the statement, he was continuously interrupted, and pressure was put on him so that he was not able to elaborate upon it. S denied this. Then TA said: "I was then taken away and thrown into a cell after I had been charged at 11.30 p.m. Then the ultimate insult came when you threw a British Movement fascist skinhead into my cell. Three police officers stood outside laughing at me and asked me what I would do about it now." S denied this.

MM cross examined. He pointed out that this was the last time that S would be appearing in the witness box in this trial. He reminded S that in his first appearance he had admitted that he hadn't followed up the details of TG's statement and he had admitted that he had no knowledge of any sort of attacks upon the 4th Idea Bookshop. At that time S had said that he could get police records to check up on this. Today he had come with the whole file relating only to 4th Idea. MM went through a catalogue of attacks on 4th Idea and S checked the police record and confirmed them all. He listed attacks on the following dates: August 31 1977; November 14 1977, March 1978, August 1978, September 1978, November 1979, abuse throughout 1979, 1980 and 1981. S admitted that he had no record of a long letter sent by the 4th Idea to the Chief Constable of the Bradford area complaining about continuous harassment and police indifference. At the end of this, he was asked if he still thought that organised fascist attacks did not take place in Bradford. He said: "Only on this specific bookshop." He was asked if he still thought that there were no racial attacks in Bradford on an organised basis. He replied that there were none "on an organised basis", although there may be an odd one. He stuck to his explanation that he had not followed up TG's statement about the attacks on the Asian community by the NF, BM and Column 88 because he did not believe that to be a genuine situation.

S had earlier claimed that he relied on the 'News of the World' and the 'Daily Express' for information about the disturbances last year. MM produced copies of the 'News of the World' from 12th and 19th July last year which described skinhead gangs attacking black people and communities. The 19 July was specifically about skinheads attacking Southall. S who prefers to believe that the attacks were by black people on the police had not read either report.

S. Kadri cross examined and took up same argument. He said: "You and all the other police officers in this case have been trying hard to tell the lie that there was no racial violence in Bradford or elsewhere."

DS Huntinton in witness box. He was supposed to have taken contemporaneous notes of the interview. TA denied that any notes were taken and asked him if he was writing under the table.

Friday 21 May

Prosecution moved on to Sabir Hussein.

DC Fletcher in witness box. He had gone to flat of TA and SH on morning of 30th. Had seen SH and asked him to come back to the police station with TA. He put SH in an interview room when they arrived. He arrested SH formally at 5.15 that evening.

J. Gibbs cross examined. Fletcher claimed that he did not know what had happened to SH in the ten hours that he was in the interview room except for one short interview when he was questioned about political meetings and petrol bombs.

internal bulletin 7 p.4.

Friday 21 May (cont)

JG put it to him that there was no short interview. Several hours were spent with SH by him together with DC Broster, when he was continuously questioned about TA. She claimed that the short interview admitted by Fletcher was just a synopsis of the many times he and Broster questioned SH. She claimed that when they found out that he was a Muslim, Broster brought out a Koran, put SH's hand on it and repeatedly put questions to him to which SH replied: "don't know". Fletcher denied all of this. He also denied any knowledge of some police officers having taken SH out in a car to point out BK's house. When he was asked why SH was arrested at 5.15 and not at 7 in the morning, he replied that he was just carrying out orders.

Broster in witness box. Denied claims that JG made, as above. He admitted that he had gone to search the flat with Windle in the morning. He admitted liaising with W in the morning. But denied that this liaison related to the progress of his interview with SH regarding TA and his political beliefs.

Crossley in witness box. He together with DC Irvine had carried out the first formal interview with SH at 7.20 p.m. on 31 July. According to him, SH had denied at first that he was present at the Pemberton Drive on 11 July. Or that he had anything to do with petrol bombs. Eventually he was told about the others who were in custody and their admissions and he then admitted attending the meeting. Windle and Irvine carried out a second interview later that evening and according to them, SH then said that he wanted to tell them everything and agreed to make a statement which was taken down by Irvine. This interview ended at 9.35 p.m.

J. Gibbs cross examined. She put it to him that when he was assigned to interview SH, he was told by Holland that SH was the only one who had not made a statement and his (Crossley's) job was to break SH down. C said his job was to interview SH. He agreed that SH had denied any involvement at the meeting at the beginning of the interview. JG put it to him: "You were getting annoyed with Sabir's lack of cooperation. You were determined to succeed where others had failed. You were so fed up with the denials that you were getting from Sabir that several times you grabbed him by his hair and pushed his head to the wall. Irvine even hit him across the left ear, to "Help him with his hearing." Crossley denied this.

He agreed that in spite of Sabir's denials he had been satisfied that Sabir was in fact involved. He claimed that eventually Sabir agreed voluntarily to make his statement and that there had been no interruptions or promptings, when Sabir dictated the statement. JG suggested that: "Whole sections of Sabir's statement came from your mouth as questions and Irvine simply took that down as Sabir's dictation." Crossley denied this. JG put it to Crossley that when S. was told to sign the statement, there was never any question of him having read it. He was simply told to sign at three X marks made by Irvine. Crossley denied this.

DC Irvine in witness box. Confirmed what Crossley had said and denied the challenges that JG made during cross examination.

Monday 24 May

Prosecution moved on to Jayesh Amin.

DC Sutcliffe in witness box. Told the court that he and DC Long went to see JA at 8 p.m. on 30 July. They asked him to come to the police station where they interviewed him and at the end of the interview they cautioned him and arrested him. In that interview, he had denied any knowledge of the petrol bombs. He had said that he was associated with the UBYL but not a member. The following morning at 10.50 Sutcliffe and Long interviewed JA again and he continued to deny any knowledge of the petrol bombs. In the end however, he admitted that a number of people had come to his house on the 11 July. According to the police, he said that

internal bulletin 7 p.5.

Monday 24 May (cont)

he did not want to be involved "because he gathered they were up to something." And he left to play cricket. Later that day at 2.30 p.m. there was a third interview where JA was told that he had not been believed. JA agreed to tell the truth this time. According to the police, he said that the others had come to the house although he had not invited them. He went out to play cricket. When he came in later, he saw a crate of milk bottles and he told the others to "get that shit out of here". Later that evening while in town he heard that some of the others had been arrested including TG and TA. So he went home and telephoned the Law Centre. That evening (31st) there was a fourth interview at 6.30 when Jayesh was told that his account of what happened seemed satisfactory but not what he described his own part to be. He was invited to get down in writing what he had said. JA agreed and Sutcliffe took it down. That was the statement. JA returned to the cell.

ER cross examined. In reply to his questions, it came out that Long and Sutcliffe had visited JA earlier on 30 July at 6.00. JA was not in at the time. So they returned later that evening to pick him up. S agreed that JA had not been cautioned before the first interview. And that they decided to arrest him only at the end of the interview. He also admitted that at the end of the first interview, JA had asked to see a solicitor. He was refused. He denied that JA had asked to see a solicitor right at the beginning at his house. It also came out when JA's detention sheet was examined, that on 31 July, JA had been interviewed by a certain officer 3903 at 5.40 p.m. Sutcliffe denied any knowledge of this. (Later officer 3903 was explained by prosecutor to be a certain DC Crowther who had been assigned to IK's case with DS Maury.)

ER went through the verbals of the interviews presented to the court and made several detailed challenges all of which were denied. He eventually put it to S. that JA had never agreed formally to give a statement and that pen and paper were put in front of him and finally he was simply asked to sign the statement. The statement itself was constituted by a series of questions and answers. He was never cautioned till his statement. S denied all of this. ER ended with the assertion that: "Jayesh said repeatedly that he wasn't involved and so this statement on its own is not enough to convict him."

E Alexander cross examined. Sutcliffe agreed that he had been specifically briefed by Holland not to arrest JA initially. He denied that any guidelines had been given regarding the interviews or any instructions regarding action to be taken in the case of denials. He admitted the possibility of the suggestion that the defendants were to be kept in the police station overnight so that they could "think things out" but he denied that this was part of a general plan.

TA cross examined. S admitted that he had gone into the interview room in which TA had been held and where he had been interviewed with regard to his political beliefs. He was in there for two hours.

DC Long in witness box.

He confirmed what Sutcliffe had said. In cross examination by ER there was nothing new except that he agreed that statements in writing made "life a lot easier."

Mr Holland in witness box. (Mr Holland was the Detective Superintendent in overall charge of this investigation last July. He has since been demoted to a uniformed superintendent and transferred to Sowerby Bridge as a result of police misconduct in the Yorkshire Ripper investigation.)

No examination by prosecution.

MM cross examined. When Holland was asked when he first became aware of TG's name, he replied: "It would not be in the interests of the defence for me to reply." He was asked again and he claimed that it was after the papers of TG's

internal bulletin 7 p.6.

Monday 24 May (cont)

first arrest on 11 July had arrived on his desk a couple of days after the arrest. He claimed that the name did not ring a bell.

H told the court that he had been the Deputy Head of the CID of Bradford since 1975. He was asked if he remembered any particular event that happened in 1975. He pretended not to understand the question. When he was prompted - "A disturbance of some magnitude?", he replied that public order offences were not his responsibility. In the end, upon further prompting, he admitted remembering a disturbance in relation to a demonstration organised by the NF in 1976. He admitted that the NF had organised the demonstration and that it had gone through the city centre to end up in Manningham, a heavily populated Asian and black area. He denied that the police had any power to stop the demonstration. He was asked about the damage caused in Manningham by the NF supporters. He replied: "That's not correct. The damage was caused mostly by counter-demonstrators." He was asked if he had seen the march and he admitted that he hadn't. He was speaking only from "experience of other marches." He denied that he was insinuating that it was the left wing protestors that did the damage but repeated: "It is usually the counter-demonstrators who cause more disorder."

MM described the consequences of this march - including the serious damage and injury and a group that was formed to protest against such fascist marches in the future. H denied any knowledge of such protests or TG's involvement in this activity. MM went on to list the whole range of campaigns and political activity that TG had been involved in, ranging from the 1976 demonstration through to the campaigns of George Lindo, Anwar Ditta and other anti-deportation campaigns, and Gary Pemberton. In each case, H claimed that he was aware of the campaign but not the personalities behind them.

MM moved on to the events of 11 July. H revealed that he had been involved in a discussion with other senior officers to determine whether the incidents of that day constituted a riot. They had come to the conclusion that it was not a riot, but later following the intervention of the City Council, they did officially label the disturbances a riot. H said that his own view was that 11 July was not a riot. But he insisted that he was not saying that "the incidents were not orchestrated."

MM moved on to 30 July. H explained that he began the briefing by describing the find of the petrol bombs and the fingerprints on them. These fingerprints had been checked with those of some of those arrested on 11 July. TG was the only one whose prints had matched. He admitted that the briefing mentioned TA, Anwar K, and several other names besides TG's. When he was asked how those names were obtained, his initial reply was: "It would not be in the interests of the defence to know." But later he conceded that "A police officer had interviewed someone somewhere and it was as a result of this, there was a list of suspects."

He admitted that Special Branch officers were present at the briefing and detailed to go into the houses. But he insisted that they were not under his command. He admitted that at this stage (by the briefing) he had a great deal of information and material about TG's political activities. He was asked whether that material came from the Special Branch. He replied: "I would prefer not to answer that question." He denied knowing whether that information had been accumulated before 11 July. He did admit that the information was about TG's involvement in specific organisations and campaigns. But he still maintained that he did not know his name before 11 July.

MM asked H whether he thought that TG was responsible for the disorder on 11 July. H replied that he was not concerned with the disorder. When asked about the police view regarding the connection between the disturbances in Bradford and other places such as Liverpool and Brixton, he replied: "That was the job of the Special Branch.... I was concerned with the factual aspects of the crime. The Special Branch would take care of the political aspects."

internal bulletin 7 p.7.

Monday 24 May (cont)

Holland admitted that as the superintendant in overall charge of the investigation, all statements would necessarily come to him before further action was taken. MM asked him whether TG's statement regarding the activity of the NF, BM and Column 88 against the Asian community in Bradford, had been followed up in any way. He replied: "I can see that you are trying to ask whether I made any checks on the bookshop." MM pointed out that he had not asked him about the bookshop and accused H of having discussed his evidence with previous police witnesses. H denied this. The question above was put again. H said that the only checks he made were in the Special Branch files and they had had not information about these organisations. He claimed that he had never heard of Column 88. MM brought out a copy of the Police Review 6.2.81 whose subject was 'White Power and the Nazis'. H claimed that he had not read that particular issue because he had been busy investigating the Yorkshire Ripper case last February.

At this point the judge intervened to ask MM whether he was suggesting that it was the police's duty to determine the truth or falsity of the statements. MM replied that that was exactly what he was suggesting. "Because it seems that the police have dismissed what TG claimed because they wanted to put forward another explanation regarding his intention. My submission is that from the pattern of the investigation the officers seem to have already made up their minds beforehand regarding this intention and so some of the most obvious points in the statement have not been followed up."

MM then came to the phone call from Dalys to 4th Idea about the skinhead invasion and H agreed that this was a crucial part of TG's explanation. He explained that he never followed it up: "Because of the nature of the bookshop, I knew the answer that I would get." He said that 4th Idea had a record of attacks by the NF and so would be sympathetic to TG's statement. MM asked: "It was extreme left wing and so you couldn't rely on them, is that it?" H replied: "I wouldn't put it like that. But people like the 4th Idea would be expected to make allegations against the NF because of their past history. I feared that I would get confirmation from 4th Idea irrespective of whether the statement was true or not. It was frequented by left wing students and alike who would turn up at every protest meeting in Bradford whatever the subject."

He denied that that is exactly what his position was regarding TG. Eventually MM put it to H: "Are you prejudiced?" Holland said no. MM read out a quotation from a speech made by H to a conference of the Royal Commission on Criminal Procedures in Oxford last September: He read it out sentence by sentence and H agreed with each sentence:

"Police officers must be prejudiced and discriminatory to do their job. Prejudice is a state of mind drawn about from experience..... Searching long haired youth in bedraggled clothing could produce drug seizures and searching West Indian youths wearing tea cosy hats and loitering in city centres, could detect mugging offences Subordinate officers are expected to act in a discriminatory way: that is against those people who by their conduct, mode of life, dress, association and transport are most likely to be criminals."

E Alexander cross examined. H was questioned about his role in the Yorkshire Ripper investigation. He admitted that there was a considerable amount of criticism of the West Yorkshire Metropolitan Police after the arrest in Jan 1981. But he denied that any criticism was directed at himself personally: "It was directed at the police in general not at any specific officer."

Regarding this case, EA put it to H that "A relatively inoffensive cache of bottles has been blown up stage by stage into a state trial.... This whole case has been mounted to curtail the activities of TA and TG..... It went to the DPP only because TG's fingerprints were found on the bottles." H denied all this and said that the case had always been treated most seriously. It had gone to the DPP solely because conspiracy charges were considered right from the start.

internal bulletin 7 p.8.

Monday 24 May (cont)

EA questioned H on the blanket ban placed on visitors and solicitors. H explained that the reason was: "Because it became obvious that we were dealing with people of Asian origin. We have only one interpreter and so visitors could have spoken to the defendants in Asian languages and messages could have got out whose content we would not have been able to check. So I had to block all visits." Alexander asked if he thought solicitors might have perverted the course of justice. H replied: "I had to guard against that possibility so I ordered the defendants to be held incommunicado until 9 a.m. on Saturday."

S. Kadri cross examined. He put it to H that the decision to arrest everyone whose name was known at the 6 o'clock briefing on 30 July was made at the very start: "The control of this case lay with the Special Branch and it was their decision. This was a political case from the beginning." H denied this. To which SK said: "The jury are not fools. They know what happened."

SK went on to racist attacks. H had been in Halifax before coming to Bradford in November 1975. Kadri reminded him of the occasion when he had said to the leaders of the Pakistani community in Halifax that there was nothing called racial violence. Kadri had been present himself. H agreed that that may have been so. SK put it to H: "You denied the Asian community in Halifax their genuine complaints. You then brought that frame of mind to Bradford and in relation to 1976 NF march you say that the violence was due not to the marchers but due to the counter-demonstrators." SK went on to bring out reports on this march in 'Telegraph and Argus' which describe the attacks by stewards of the NF march on the counter-demonstrators led by Edward Lyon M.P. H simply replied that he was speaking from his own experience of marches in general, that he was not there at the NF march himself. When asked about the Home Office report on racial attacks, he replied that he knew of it and of his force's involvement in it, but "I myself did not participate in it It dealt with only 0.75% of the total crime in this country." SK pointed out the large number of arson attacks and murders in the Asian community in Bradford including the murder of Mohammed Arif by a known BM supporter last year, who was later convicted. "This man died because of the colour of his skin." H said that he knew of this last case because he was involved in the investigation himself. "But it wasn't a racist attack." According to H, MA was murdered simply because he resembled the lover of the murderer's girlfriend. SK put it to H: "I suggest that the West Yorkshire Police in general and you in particular are deliberately running down racial violence. I accuse you."

M Russell cross examined. She went into the details of the frame up of George Lindo and the subsequent compensation that he obtained from the WYP.

G Robertson cross examined. H admitted that he took personal responsibility for objecting to bail for the defendants right after they were arrested. And as a result of this they all spent two or three months in prison already. "I would have continued to object to bail if they hadn't been granted it." He also admitted that it was he who proposed the condition that they attend no political meetings or activities when they finally did get bail. GR pointed out that he had thought it right to oppose bail without having explored what actually motivated the making of the petrol bombs.

H replied that most of the statements explained the motive quite clearly to be rioting. GR insisted: "You as the officer in charge of the investigation had foreclosed a whole area of inquiry on the basis of one view... And the question of which of the stated intentions was correct was a matter which you did not investigate thoroughly If you had followed the trail to the 4th Idea Bookshop and the other points mentioned in some of the statements, the reality would have been that a number of very frightened young men had in fact made the petrol

internal bulletin 7 p. 9.

Monday 24 May (cont)

bombs fearing an attack on their community from skinheads." H insisted that by Friday evening there were a number of statements apart from TG's and TA's in front of him and he assessed all evidence before him fairly.

E Rees cross examined. He took up the police claim that all of the defendants had made "voluntary statements". "did you in any of your briefings make it an objective to obtain written statements?" H replied: "They are desirable but I could not make any such directive."

H restated that none of the 12 defendants saw a solicitor until he himself raised the embargo on Saturday 9 a.m. He admitted that one of the solicitors, Ruth Bundy, had been ringing the police station from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. throughout Thursday 30 July. She was eventually told about the embargo and she rang back on Friday repeatedly until she was allowed to speak to H later in the afternoon. He admitted that it was as a result of this meeting that he decided to see his legal adviser regarding the conspiracy charges and he decided to extend the embargo. He denied ER's suggestion that the solicitors were denied access only because they might have advised their clients of their right to remain silent. E¹ suggested that H check up the facts with DI Windle ... who had admitted that this was in fact the reason. Judge intervened. ER put it to H: "You would accept that if any of the 12 admissions were obtained under pressure, it would not be right of us to rely on you?" H was reluctant to answer and JB intervened once again.

TA cross examined. H explained that TA's house had been raided by his officers because he was a suspect due to his association with TG. TA pointed out that the only association he had with TG was a purely legal political one. "So what was the basis of your raid on my house? The only information you could have got regarding me was political information." All H would say in reply was that he had reason to suspect TA.

H Kennedy cross examined. She took up the blanket ban on visitors and solicitors impose by H. And he explained once again that the reason was the need for secrecy. According to him, this 'secrecy' is supposed to have been maintained until 9 a.m. on Saturday. HK pointed out that news of the petrol bombs and the investigation was on the radio and on the 'Telegraph and Argus' on the afternoon of the 30th, so where was the secrecy? H himself had spoken on the radio that afternoon. "The truth is you were refusing access to solicitors because you wanted to obtain written statements from the defendants before they saw anyone." H denied this.

Tuesday 25 May

Jury was released for the day. Defence counsel made a series of submissions for 'no case to answer'. The three major submissions were made by MM and adopted for all the rest by defence counsel. The first two submissions stated that the prosecution had failed to prove that damage to life and property had been intended by the Bradford 12; or that explosive substances were made for unlawful purposes. The third submission was that the prosecution had failed to prove that petrol bombs are an explosive substance.

There were detailed submissions on behalf of some of the other defendants as well.

At the end of the day the judge ruled against all three major submissions. He said that the indictment will go in its present form to the jury and that he was satisfied with the Crown's argument on the matter of the explosive substance. He indicated that he would rule on the submission on behalf of JA the next day but decided that he would direct verdicts of not guilty regarding count 1 (manufacture) against Sabir Hussein and Saeed Hussein.

internal bulletin 7 p.10.

Tuesday 25 May

There was a long and complicated discussion in the course of the day relating to count 2 (conspiracy) and the burden of proof. It was suggested by the prosecution that the burden of proof should lie with the defence because of the nature of the count. However this was in the end conceded not to be the case and the onus of proof remains with the prosecutor.

The following is a list of policemen involved in the arrests and interviews on 30/31 July. (some of the names may be wrong in the earlier notes. This list has been checked.)

TG: DI Sidebottom
DS Huntington

BK: DS Crossley
DC Irvine
DI Sidebottom
DS Huntinton

MM: DI Sidebottom
DS Huntington

AM: DI Windle
DC Broster

VP: DC Vickerman
DC Crossland

SdH: DC White
DC Fletcher
DC Porter
PC Mullaney
DS Palmer

IK: DS Maury
DC Powell
DS Huntington
DI Sidebottom

PP: DC White
DC Fletcher

GS: DI Windle
DS Proctor

TA: DI Windle
DC Vickerman
DI Sidebottom
DS Huntington

SbH: DC Fletcher
DC Broster
DS Crossley
DC Irvine

JA: DC Sutcliffe
DC Long